

04-018

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in the present application Claims 3, 7-23 have been cancelled, Claims 1, 2, and 6 have been amended, and Claims 24-32 have been added, leaving Claims 1-2, 4-6, and 24-32 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. The Specification has been amended to correct certain typographical errors.

Claim 1 has been amended to include a housing. Support for this amendment can at least be found in Claim 3 as originally filed.

Claim 2 has been amended to reflect the addition of the housing in Claim 1. Support for this amendment can at least be found in Paragraphs [0024] and [0026] and Figure 3 as originally filed.

Claim 4 was amended to correct the claim dependency.

Claim 6 was amended to correctly provide for antecedent basis. Support for this amendment can at least be found in Paragraphs [0019] and [0020] as originally filed.

Claims 24-32 have been added to further claim the present invention. Support for these new claims can be at least found in Paragraphs [0017], [0018], [0019], [0023], and [0024].

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments or new claims. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Elections/Restrictions

The Examiner contends that: Group I, Claims 1-6, is drawn to a brake structure used in a wind turbine; Group II, Claims 7-12, is drawn to a tower structure with yaw bearings and transformer used in a wind turbine; Group III, Claims 13-17, is drawn to a roller bearing structure used in a wind turbine; and Group IV, Claims 18-21 is drawn to a power transmission system for a wind turbine. Pursuant to MPEP §§ 806.04 and 808.01 the Examiner requires restriction between Groups I – IV.

Accordingly, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §121, Applicants confirm the election of Group I, Claims 1-6. By this Amendment, Claims 7-21 have been canceled. This election is being made without prejudice to Applicants' rights with respect to Claims 7-21, Groups II-IV, including the right to file divisional application(s) thereon.

04-018

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 has been amended to correctly provide an antecedent basis for the limitation "transformer". Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,285,090 to Brutsaert et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,990,568 to Hildingsson et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness, i.e., that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made.

Brutsaert et al. teaches a wind turbine having a nacelle, a plurality of blades and a generator driven by the plurality of blades. The braking system taught by Brutsaert is described with reference to the embodiment shown in Figure 4 of the '090 patent. In this embodiment, the alternator (40) is enclosed by a frame (60) that rotates with the blades (5). The alternator (40) is mounted to rotate about a fixed shaft (44) through bearings (56,57). The brake (65) appears in Figure 4 to be a caliper style brake with the disk being mounted to a rotor disk (43) that is part of the frame (60). The caliper portion appears to be mounted to a structure (46) that is part of the nacelle (3).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1, as amended is not anticipated, nor is obvious in view of Brutsaert et al. in further view of Hildingsson. Applicants independent Claim 1 requires that the shaft be rotatably mounted to the

04-018

nacelle. Additionally, Claim 1 requires the generator housing be mounted to the nacelle with the brake mounted to the generator housing.

In contrast to independent Claim 1, Applicant's respectfully submit that the combination Brutsaert et al. with Hildingsson et al. would not have the limitations required by independent Claim 1. The wind turbine taught by Brutsaert et al. shows a fixed shaft about which the alternator (40) and the alternator frame (60) rotate. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Brutsaert et al. or Hildingsson et al. teach or suggest a wind turbine having a brake mounted to a non-rotating generator housing that is mounted to the nacelle. The alternator housing (60) of Brutsaert is not one that can be fixed or stationary since the components are located within the blade nosecone assembly. Thus the alternator (40), frame (60) and blade nosecone (58) rotate together as a single component. Additionally, amended claim 1 requires that a shaft rotably coupled to the nacelle. The generator is mounted to a shaft separately from the blade nosecone assembly between the nosecone and the nacelle. This differs from the wind turbine taught by Brutsaert which uses a fixed shaft (44) (Column 4, line 26) to support both the blade nosecone (58) and alternator frame (60). Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 1 patentably defines over Brutsaert et al. in view of Hildingsson et al. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-6 which depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1 and incorporate all the limitations of Claim 1 further require additional limitations. For reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Brutsaert et al. or Hildingsson et al. teach or suggest the wind turbine as claimed in Claims 2, 4-6. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 2, 4-6 are patentably defined over Brutsaert et al. in view of Hildingsson et al. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of Claims 2, 4-6 is respectfully requested.

04-018


Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections. It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly reconsideration and allowance is earnestly requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 503125.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of to Deposit Account No. 503125.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Dave S. Christensen
Registration No. 40,955

Date: February 1, 2006
Address: 10 Technology Drive, Wallingford, CT 06492
Telephone: 203-678-2122
Facsimile: 203-678-2276
Customer No.: 41405